

list thus secured remained in force until the spring of 1913. A special committee of the board of education was then appointed to do things to commercial subjects. (The members of this committee can be learned from the proceedings of the board). This committee recommended the exclusive adoption of a set of book-keeping texts published by Lyons & Carnation, successors to Lyons & Co.

The only recommendation from any one connected with the educational activities of the schools was that of the recently elected supervisor of commercial subjects (Bachrach). As a teacher of shorthand he is recognized as good, but by his own statement he is not a bookkeeper and has slight, if any, knowledge of accounting. The supervisor assigned for his reason for the adoption the fact that the book "was already in use in a majority of the schools." To be exact, five out of the eighteen.

The text thus adopted for the first year work came in as a brand-new book just off the press. In fact, however, it was the same name and the price that constituted most of the newness. Nearly all the matter, including the serious faults contained in the old book that was discredited by the teachers a few years before, came back under a new name, but for that no less objectionable.

But this is what the taxpayer will be interested in: The cost to the student for the first year outfit was, under the old title \$1.85. Now under the new title, claimed and represented as a brand-new book, with added matter that costs less than 15 cents, the cost as first adopted by the board during the summer was \$2.70, which price the publishers magnanimously reduced to the student to \$2.51. Has the cost of living caused this increase of 66 cents in the price each student must pay for his book?

This is one of the very few instances where text books have been

adopted without the teachers using them, or a committee of principals, or the superintendent of schools endorsing their sufficiency for the work.

The entire committee knew a majority of the teachers considered the Lyon book as unfit to teach book-keeping from, as is the English text unfit to teach English from. Its adoption was a very suspicious proceeding.

In an article on page 4 of the Record-Herald of March 18, 1914, written by an expert on commercial text books, occurs this paragraph regarding the Lyons text on bookkeeping:

"But whoever is responsible for the recent exclusive adoption made of an inferior text book, ridiculous in its pretensions, of a patchwork character, filled with crudities and absurdities and illogical in treatment, has placed a very serious handicap upon the study of this subject. As an additional discouragement to the pursuit of this subject, according to rumor, it is proposed by the committee on revision of courses to reduce the credit for this subject to less than that of shorthand and type-writing. What a spectacle does this shabby treatment of commercial education in Chicago, second to New York only in population, but not so in commercial importance, present in comparison with many of the smaller cities of the country."

I'm told that Lyons' head man took the article quoted above to a noted Chicago expert accountant and asked him what answer to make to the charges. The accountant replied: "There is no answer. Every word is true."—Elizabeth A. De Velde.

GREEK PUNISHMENT.—In judging the egregious Mr. Moga, who reproves small boys with deadly missiles, you must bear in mind that in his country such trifles are lightly considered.

A well-known Greek bootmaker of Cairo, Egypt, missing some small ar-